



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Homer and History. By WALTER LEAF, London: The Macmillan Co., 1915. Pp. XIII + 325; Appendix; Maps.

In this book Mr. Leaf returns, with fresh conviction, to a reënforcement of his theme of nearly twenty-five years ago, that the Iliad and Odyssey "really do depict the Achaian age, as they profess". Subsequent discoveries in Crete and elsewhere have entailed important modifications, but he finds material within Homer for a plausible argument from what he fairly describes as historic data. He states his theory confidently but without dogmatism. As a reasonable working hypothesis, at least until a new turn of the spade brings fresh evidence, this thesis may find acceptance with scholars who are reluctant to concede the Epic estates to Aegean mortmain or to degrade the Olympians to seventh century *parvenus*. If we can believe with Mr. Leaf not only in a real Trojan war, waged by real men in the twelfth century, but also in the genesis of a wholly Greek epic within the limits of the "dark" centuries, we need neither fear the threat of Minoan maieutic to extract an embryonic "Little" Iliad from the undeciphered Cretan script nor admit the distorting *reductio* to a least common denominator—say of *circa* 600 B. C.—alike for Hellene, Hindu, Iranian, Semite and Chinese (cf. Gilbert Murray: Four Stages of Greek Religion, 57, note).

The author lays stress on the confirmation of his beliefs derived from H. Munro Chadwick's independent study of the Teutonic and Greek heroic poems. He says, p. xii, "To the instruction and encouragement which I received from The Heroic Age (published 1912), the existence of this book is largely due". He returns repeatedly to Chadwick's work.

Mr. Leaf, in chapter I, claims that Homer differentiates clearly between men and gods. The Heraclitean formulæ (cf. Lucian, Vit. Auctio, 14) that men are *θεοὶ θνητοί*, and gods *ἄνθρωποι ἀθάνατοι*, would probably satisfy neither Mr. Leaf nor Homer. Divine descent in Homer has nothing in common with worship in later Greece. The two conceptions are divorced. In Homer "two heroes have divine descent and heroic honours; two have divine descent but no honours; four have human descent and heroic honours". . . . "The heroes of Homer show no sign of superhuman origin" and the divine government of the world is an "epiphenomenon." Some, at least, of

Homer's heroes were historic men with these actual names, e. g. Agamemnon, Achilles, Odysseus; but it is not necessary to assume historicity for every name: the dog Argos, for example; nor, perhaps, for Penelope. But "Helen was Helen before she dressed for the masquerade of mythology".

In his chapter on "The Coming of the Achaeans", Mr. Leaf joins issue with the theory of Mr. Evans that "the age of Homer is more recent than the latest stage of anything that can be called Minoan or Mycenaean". The Achaeans, he thinks, intruded as a new race upon the Minoans, who had settled in Greece and conquered still older aborigines, and became in turn from the fourteenth century onwards the dominant tribe—perhaps a few thousands only forming an aristocratic, military class—but that this took place without involving at first any perceptible change in the art and culture of the land, though their language prevailed.

As illustrating the plausibility of this contention, Mr. Leaf makes an extended comparison with the Norman conquest of the Saracens in Sicily. The Normans came into the inheritance of two hundred and thirty years of Saracen culture. "With the Saracen and Greek to his subjects, the Norman had really no need to innovate; he had simply to bid the men of the land to go on working for him instead of for any other." (Cited from Freeman in *Encyc. Brit.* xvii, 551, 9th ed.)

The application of this interpretation of the kind of contact which took place between Achaeans and Minoans is developed by Mr. Leaf, and he sketches the probable route of these peoples, coming from the north by way of Epirus (rather than via Thessaly). He goes on to account for the Achaean expansion to the coast of Asia Minor. In the thirteenth century the Hittite Empire was already in decline, and the barrier to invaders, covetous of the Asia Minor littoral, was weakening. First of all, however, it was necessary to secure the Troad, a strategic position from time immemorial, through which the "northern pressure had its path of least resistance . . . , if they were to win a solid footing in the Hermos Valley." And so in the Trojan war there met as rivals the long parted divisions of the invaders from the Balkans—the Dardanian Phrygians whose ancestors had moved southeastward through Thrace, and the Achaeans who had gone southwest through Epirus.

In chapter III, "Boeotia", Mr. Leaf not only denies, as do others, the Homeric authenticity of the Catalogue of the Ships, but draws additional logical conclusions which are still further fortified in his subsequent chapters. (E. g. the excision, unwelcome on sentimental grounds, of the whole Aulis romance.) The Homeric inhabitants of the canton are Cadmeans, not Boeotians. The latter came in two generations later. Thucydides,

he thinks, knew this bit of history but did not venture openly to "Megarize".

Incidentally, Mr. Leaf excludes also the "embryo catalogue", contained in Il. xiii, 685-722, with its intrusive *Ἰάοιες ἐλκεχίτωρες*, subsequently calling it "Ionia" to distinguish, along with the "Boeotia", from Homer. "The whole proportion and perspective of the Iliad is distorted in the Catalogue" (i. e. of the Ships), p. 107.

In three chapters Mr. Leaf discusses: "The Dominion of Peleus"; "The Dominion of Odysseus"; and "The Realm of Agamemnon." In these 132 pages he makes an examination of the principal kingdoms of the Achæans, as they may be mapped out from Homer, and compares these regions with the data indicated in the Catalogue. The result is cumulative against the "Homericity" of the latter. The Catalogue, for example, based on no real knowledge of inner Thessaly, breaks up the Kingdom of Peleus into topographically impossible parcels, as shown on his map, page 128.

The discussion of the "Dominion of Odysseus" and, incidentally, of the Odyssey is of great interest. Mr. Leaf refuses to treat the bulk of the Odyssey as yielding, like the Iliad, data of historic events or of sober topography. His objections, however, to M. Bérard's revision of the Corfu-Phæacian theory are not new. M. Champault had conclusively demonstrated, long since, that M. Bérard's identification of the west side of the island is, if anything, less satisfactory than the orthodox tradition, although Champault's own identification of Phæacia with Ischia failed to satisfy other *indicia* in the text.

But Mr. Leaf allows Odysseus to return from the realm of fancy into reality when he comes to Ithaca and the neighboring islands and territory. He gives interesting details of the Echinades group and Dragonera Island (map, page 164, "after Admiralty Chart 203"). In a note, page 165, he tells us that the Pauly-Wissowa article on these islands is useless to inquirers. He has no unreasoned prejudice, however, against everything Teutonic and endorses, restates more clearly and reënforces with fresh data Dr. Dörpfeld's Leucas-Ithaca theory.

While giving constructive evidence for the wide-spread realm of Agamemnon Mr. Leaf gathers up many details, hinted at before, into a plausible reënforcement of his theory of the contact, chronological and geographical, between Minoan and Achæan and of his belief in the complete intrusiveness of the matter in the Catalogue of the Ships. His conception of the extent of Achæan rule, with Mycenæ at its centre, is made clear to the eye by the large folding map appended to the book. Agamemnon's supremacy is passively acknowledged by Odysseus (cf. Il. iv, 204-6), and by Idomeneus of Crete (cf. Il. iv, 266f.). Only Achilles the "hot-headed son of the King of

Phthia, in the extreme north sounds the note of independence”.

Mycenae was “the residence for several generations at least of kings of astonishing wealth and culture”. All the strongholds of the Argolid were subservient to it. Mycenae was not an outpost of Corinth (assumed by some as Agamemnon’s capital) for the very good reason, as Mr. Leaf boldly and incautiously asserts (p. 210), that “in Agamemnon’s days there was no [town of] Corinth in existence”! Mindful, however, of the irrepressible excavator Mr. Leaf adds (page 214), that he would submit to evidence if a real Mycenaean layer—not a few chance sherds—should be discovered in this vicinity, but feels confident that none such will ever be found. But just this has happened in the last year. Mr. Blegen, secretary of the American School at Athens, has discovered an indubitable Mycenaean site nearby on the Gulf of Corinth, and now a number of other sites, including one near Hexamilia, found in the vicinity of Old Corinth, are waiting further excavation. Ancient Ephyre, it seems probable, will be identified about where we might expect to find it.

In the chapter on “The Fusion of Races” is to be found, illustrated by suggestive parallels from modern history, the exposition of the author’s solution of this knotty problem. “The Achaeans are soldiers, who have inherited the art and wealth of the Minoans, whom they have succeeded; the subjects are tillers of the soil, accustomed to serfdom, and living on by the side of their masters, yet having little in common with them beyond the payment of their dues”.

This subject population, probably akin to the Achæans in blood (Mr. Leaf implies that they may have been immigrants from the north in pre-Minoan days), differed widely from them in culture and thought. After the Achæan aristocracy had been weakened by the long Trojan war there followed a fusion of religious beliefs as well as of political life, and the result was a compromise and blend as in the case of Norman and Saxon, though in different proportion and with some sharp differences in result. The more aristocratic though “*parvenu*” Olympians (cf. Aesch. Eum. 778), largely dominated the darker sediment of rustic ritualism. No convenient herd of swine was near by to make off *en masse* with the “Eniautos-daimon” and the rest of the autochthonous demons, but ultimately the gulfs washed most of them down.

In the closing chapter, “The Achaian Epos,” Mr. Leaf’s summary includes certain propositions which may be thus condensed: Both poems have an historical basis in a Trojan war, which was a necessary prelude to the expansion of Greece eastwards. Tradition, tested by geography and archaeology, preserves intact so much that we must believe in its continuity

and assume that it began on the mainland before the days of the great colonization; that the court lays (cf. Chadwick's Heroic Age), sung in Achaean Mycenae, Pylos, and Sparta, were taken to Asia Minor and developed and perfected; that some of the Achæan leaders were real men under real names (Mr. Leaf is not troubled by sarcastic references to Menelaus as "a well-known infantry officer with auburn whiskers"); and that the matter in the Catalogue of the Greek Ships cannot be reconciled with the rest of Homer.

Mr. Leaf, finally, does not deny the need of further light upon problems such as: (a) What, if anything, does the Homeric Epos contain of tradition earlier than itself? (b) Does Heracles typify Minoan civilization? (c) Are the adventures of Odysseus based on Minoan legend? (d) How is the Homeric Epos related to all the mass of Athenian legend?

Mr. Leaf's full exposition of his theories cannot be fairly judged by any abridgment. His great authority as an Homeric scholar will inevitably secure for this his latest contribution a detailed study of the whole context.

FRANCIS G. ALLINSON.

BROWN UNIVERSITY.

Lucian's Atticism. The Morphology of the Verb. (Dissertation presented in candidacy for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy) by ROY J. DEFERRARI. Princeton University Press, 1916. Pp. 82+ (annotated) index.

This dissertation, confined to the morphology of the verb, is the fruit of an investigation of Lucian's language in relation to the other Atticists and to the *κοινή*.

Previous studies of Lucian's Atticism, the author urges, are incomplete or are based on imperfect knowledge of MS readings and of their relative value. He acknowledges, however, his indebtedness to Du Mesnil, Chabert, and Schmid. For his own examination of MS evidence he depends on Nilén's critical edition, as far as it goes, i. e., Nos. 1-14, and for the remainder fortifies himself by a collation of Jacobitz, Fritzsche, Sommerbrodt, etc., supplemented by photographic facsimiles of FUZN.

This process, he believes, affords "sufficient control of both groups of MSS to make this study possible".

Seven pieces included in the Lucianic corpus he excludes altogether, either as obviously spurious or, in the case of the two pseudo-Ionic pieces, as not germane to a discussion on Atticism. Fourteen other pieces are relegated to discussion in footnotes for varying reasons: two, the Podagra and Ocypus, as written in verse; the Lexiphanes (though genuine, as he